



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/817,330	04/02/2004	Qi Jia	0062.26	1136	
25871	7590	09/03/2009 SWANSON & BRATSCHUN, L.L.C. 8210 SOUTHPARK TERRACE LITTLETON, CO 80120			
		EXAMINER WINSTON, RANDALL O			
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER	
		1655			
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE			
09/03/2009		ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

cfspatents@sbiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/817,330	Applicant(s) JIA, QI
	Examiner Randall Winston	Art Unit 1655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 19-30,32,46-66 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 19-30,32 and 46-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1449)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0808 and 1108
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement is made of receipt and entry of the amendment filed on 08/20/2008.

Claims 19-30, 32, 46-59 and new claims 60-66 have been examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-30, 32 and 46-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu (US 6,083,921) in view of Zhou (US 6,319,523) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action which are restated below.

Applicant claims a pharmaceutical composition (i.e. topical) comprising Free-B-ring flavonoid (i.e. baicalin), Flavans (i.e. catechin) and excipients in various amounts.

Xu teaches a topical pharmaceutical composition (i.e. the pharmaceutical composition is applied as a cream) comprising baicalin (i.e. the baicalin is extracted from *Scutellaria*) and excipients (i.e. the pharmaceutical carrier could be water) within a pharmaceutical composition used for antibacterial purposes. Xu, however, does not expressly teach the Flavan of catechin included within its pharmaceutical composition used for antibacterial purposes (see, e.g. entire patent including abstract, column 12 lines 25-32 and claims 1 and 7).

Zhou beneficially teaches catechin (i.e. the catechin is extracted from *Acacia catechu*) contained within a pharmaceutical composition used for antibacterial purposes (see, e.g. abstract, claims, especially claims 1 and 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Xu's topical pharmaceutical composition to include the other active ingredient of catechin as taught in Zhou because the above combined two references would create the claimed topical pharmaceutical to be used for antibacterial purposes. Moreover, as discussed in MPEP Section 2114.06, "it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose (e.g. an antibacterial purpose), in order to form a third composition to be used for the same purpose". The adjustments of other conventional working conditions(i.e. determining suitable amounts/ranges of each active ingredient within the claimed composition and the substitution of one form for another such as the composition is formulated in a regular or controlled releasing vehicle), is deemed a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Accordingly, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Please note, the intended use of the above claimed composition (i.e. the pharmaceutical composition for use in the treatment of cyclooxygenase (COX) and (LOX) mediated diseases and/or inflammatory conditions and/or skin conditions) does not patentably distinguish the composition, *per se*, since such undisclosed use is intrinsic to the composition reasonably suggested by the cited references above (see, e.g., MPEP 2112).

Please also note that the patentability of a product (i.e. in claims 24-29) does not depend upon the method of production. If the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, then the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process" (see, e.g. MPEP 2113).

Applicant's arguments filed on 08/20/2008 have been carefully considered but they are not deemed persuasive. Applicant argues within its response and by submitting a Declaration that Examiner's cited combined two references of Xu and Zhou create a topical pharmaceutical used for antibacterial purposes. Therefore, neither of the cited references of Xu or Zhou teaches or suggests that any of the compositions and/or compounds would be useful in the treatment of COX and LOX mediated diseases or conditions or be useful to treat skin conditions.

Although Applicant argues neither of the cited references of Xu or Zhou teaches or suggests that any of the compositions and/or compounds would be useful in the treatment of COX and LOX mediated diseases or conditions or be useful to treat skin

condition, Applicant's argument is not deemed persuasive because the intended use of the above claimed does not patentably distinguish the composition, *per se*, since such undisclosed use is intrinsic to the composition reasonably suggested by the cited references (see, e.g., MPEP 2112). As set forth above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Xu's topical pharmaceutical composition to include the other active ingredient of catechin as taught in Zhou because the above combined two references would create the claimed topical pharmaceutical to be used for antibacterial purposes. Moreover, as discussed in MPEP Section 2114.06, "it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose (e.g. an antibacterial purpose), in order to form a third composition to be used for the same purpose". The adjustments of other conventional working (i.e. determining suitable amounts/ranges of each active ingredient within the claimed composition and the substitution of one form for another such as the composition is formulated in a regular or controlled releasing vehicle), is deemed a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Accordingly, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RANDALL WINSTON whose telephone number is (571)272-0972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RW

/Christopher R. Tate/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655